



State of Utah

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
DIVISION OF OIL, GAS AND MINING

Michael O. Leavitt
Governor

Robert L. Morgan
Executive Director

Lowell P. Braxton
Division Director

1594 West North Temple, Suite 1210

PO Box 145801

Salt Lake City, Utah 84114-5801

(801) 538-5340 telephone

(801) 359-3940 fax

(801) 538-7223 TTY

www.nr.utah.gov

November 18, 2002

TO: Minerals File

FROM: Paul Baker, Senior Reclamation Biologist *PBB*

RE: Site Inspection, Geokinetics, Seep Ridge Project, M/047/002, Uintah County, Utah

Date of Inspection: November 14, 2002
Time of Inspection: 8:30 to 11:30 a.m.
Conditions: Cloudy, 30's
Participants: Mickey Schott, Geokinetics; Paul Baker, DOGM

Purpose of Inspection:

The operator recently closed the water monitoring wells and scarified and seeded several areas. We wanted to look at the work that was done and make sure it was adequate.

Getting to the site:

The site is about 56 miles south of U. S. Highway 40 on the Seep Ridge Road. The report for the August 21, 2002, inspection gives more details.

Observations:

All of the non-public roads have been ripped and seeded except for the short access road to the water well. Although it does not appear there was an attempt to make the rips parallel to the contour, I do not anticipate any serious erosion problems because the terrain is not too steep. People have driven enough on the road leading from the Seep Ridge Road to the pipeline road that the rips have been pretty much smoothed over.

There was a road through the camp area, and this was the only part of this area that was ripped. There are several places dominated by weeds in the camp area that were not ripped or, I presume, seeded (Photo 1).

Photo 2 shows the area southeast of where the shop building stood. This area was ripped and seeded. I did not measure or pace the distance between rips, but, as I recall and based on the photos, it varied from about four feet to less than one foot.

We went to the all of the monitoring well sites. These sites and the access roads have been ripped and seeded, and there was no surface evidence of the wells. I took photos of all of these sites but have only included one (Photo 3) in this report.

There was some old equipment at the water well, and some of the soil was stained as if from a diesel or oil spill.

The report for the August 21, 2002, inspection mentions three brush piles that were to be spread around. I only remember seeing two, and during this inspection we only found two. Although I had expected these piles to be spread over large areas, they were, instead, spread around the immediate areas where these piles had been (Photo 4).

As we walked over the site, we periodically checked for seed and found it in every place we checked.

Conclusions and Recommendations:

I cannot verify how the monitoring wells were sealed, but the surface reclamation looked good.

Portions of the camp area containing mostly weeds should be ripped and seeded. There was one other area southeast of the entrance that should also be ripped and seeded.

The operator may want to rip and seed the area southeast of the shop pad a little better, but I decided to leave this to their judgment. I anticipate that seeded grasses will grow in the rip marks, but I do not expect much growth outside these marks.

Although the brush piles were not spread like I expected them to be, I have no problem with the way it was done. It may take a few years before there is much growth in some of these areas, but because the soil will have so much organic matter, I expect production to be very good once plants start to come back.

The water well has now been transferred to the Uintah County Special Service District, but there is a rancher that has used the well. I am not certain who actually spilled fuel or oil in this area, but even though the operator probably had nothing to do with the spill, they need to take some responsibility for getting it cleaned up since it is within the permitted area.

The site is on land managed by the School and Institutional Trust Lands Administration (SITLA), and on November 13, 2002, I received a telephone call from John Blake with SITLA about the well. SITLA wants the operator to either transfer ownership of the well and its associated water right to them or to reclaim the well. Since the well has already been transferred to another party, neither of these options is entirely within the control of the operator. I am not certain how the operator will be able to resolve this conflict, but I advised Mr. Schott to begin by contacting Mr. Blake.

Page 3

Geokinetics, Seep Ridge Project

M/047/002

November 21, 2002

Mr. Schott asked about having the bond amount reduced, and this should be possible. The operator should make this request in writing. Reclamation for which the Division needs to continue to hold a bond includes the water well and some revegetation work.

jb

cc: John Blake, SITLA

Mickey Schott, Geokinetics

E:\seepridge\ins111402.doc

ATTACHMENT
November 18, 2002
Photographs
M/047/002, Seep Ridge Mine, Geokinetics



Photo 1. Camp area with ripped and seeded road on the lower right. Parts of the area have little desirable vegetation and were not ripped and seeded.



Photo 2. Area southeast of where the shop building was.



Photo 3. One of the water monitoring well sites.



Photo 4. One of the brush piles.